

Pre



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/017,329	02/02/1998	RYUICHI MATSUKURA	1083.1049/JD	8159

21171 7590 12/05/2003
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CARDONE, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

31

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/017,329

Applicant(s)

MATSUKURA, RYUICHI

Examiner

Jason D Cardone

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: See Attached Office Action.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the remarks of the applicant (Paper No. 30) filed on 9/23/03. Claims 1-11 and 16-22 presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-11 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoub, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,813, in view of Carpenter et al. (hereinafter Carpenter), U.S. Patent No. 6,477,581.

4. Regarding claim 1, Yacoub discloses a computer network system in which plural connecting means is provided in a network circuit to which a first computer has been connected, and a second computer is connected to one of the connecting means, wherein; the first computer comprises resource information managing means for managing information relating to hardware or software, including a position in the real world for each of the hardware or software, which are usable through the network circuit, and resource information processing means for taking out the content of the resource information managing means in response to a request of information relating to usable hardware or software from another computer, and transmitting to the network circuit [ie. the server, Yacoub, col. 6, line 46 – col. 7, line 9 and col. 10, lines 28-65];

the second computer comprises resource setting means for setting the hardware or software according to the content of the hardware or software information transmitted by the resource information processing means of the first computer [ie. the client with virtual printer, Yacoub, col. 4, line 28 – col. 5, line 13 and col. 11, lines 1-52]; and

when the second computer is connected to the network circuit through any one of the plural connecting means, the resource setting means receives the content of the hardware or software information transmitted by the resource information processing means of the first computer and sets the hardware or software [Yacoub, col. 4, line 28 – col. 5, line 13 and col. 6, lines 46-65].

Yacoub does disclose the use of portable data assistant (PDA) does not specifically disclose connecting means capable of connecting and disconnecting a computer. However, Carpenter, in the same field of endeavor, discloses connecting means capable of connecting and disconnecting a computer [Carpenter, col. 3, line 48 – col. 4, line 40 and col. 5, lines 12-44]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate connections means for portable devices, disclosed by Carpenter, in the network system, disclosed by Yacoub, in order to have user-friendly connection [Carpenter, col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 9].

5. Regarding claim 2, claim 2 has similar limitations as claim 1 and additional limitations of a resource installation position managing means for managing the position at which the resource managed by the resource information managing means exists and selecting an arbitrary resource. Therefore, the similar limitations are disclosed

under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1]. Also, Yacoub-Carpenter further discloses the resource installation position managing means for managing the position at which the resource managed by the resource information managing means exists and selecting an arbitrary resource [Yacoub, col. 10, lines 28-65].

6. Regarding claim 3, claim 3 has similar limitations as claim 1 and additional limitations of a resource information holding means for holding the resource information relating to the resources that can be managed directly and comparing means for comparing the content of the resource information holding means and the content of the resource information managing means of the first computer, detecting a replaceable resource. Therefore, the similar limitations are disclosed under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1]. Also, Yacoub-Carpenter further discloses resource information holding means for holding the resource information relating to the resources that can be managed directly and comparing means for comparing the content of the resource information holding means and the content of the resource information managing means of the first computer, detecting a replaceable resource [Yacoub, col. 6, line 46 – col. 7, line 9].

7. Regarding claim 4, claim 4 has similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1].

8. Regarding claim 5, claim 5 has similar limitations as claim 1 and additional limitations of a resource information holding means for holding the resource information relating to the resources that can be managed directly and comparing means for comparing the content of the resource information holding means and the content of the resource information managing means of the first computer, detecting a replaceable resource. Therefore, the similar limitations are disclosed under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1]. Also, Yacoub-Carpenter further discloses resource information holding means for holding the resource information relating to the resources that can be managed directly and comparing means for comparing the content of the resource information holding means and the content of the resource information managing means of the first computer, detecting a replaceable resource [Yacoub, col. 6, line 46 – col. 7, line 9].

9. Regarding claim 6, claim 6 has similar limitations as claim 1 and additional limitations of a resource updating means for updating the content of the resource information managing means when receiving an updated resource. Therefore, the similar limitations are disclosed under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1]. Also, Yacoub-Carpenter further discloses a resource updating means for updating the content of the resource information managing means when receiving updated resource information [Yacoub, col. 2, lines 25-29 and col. 6, lines 32-42].

10. Regarding claims 7-9, claims 7-9 have similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1].

11. Regarding claims 10 and 11, claims 10-11 has similar limitations as claim 1 and additional limitations of a resource noticing means for noticing the content of the resource information managing means and updating resource information registering means by receiving the updated resource information from the computer. Therefore, the similar limitations are disclosed under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1]. Also, Yacoub-Carpenter further discloses a resource noticing means for noticing the content of the resource information managing means and updating resource information registering means by receiving the updated resource information from the computer [Yacoub, col. 2, lines 25-29 and col. 6, lines 32-42].

12. Regarding claims 16-22, claims 16-22 have similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected under Yacoub-Carpenter for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 [Supra 1].

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 16-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason D Cardone whose telephone number is (703) 305-8484. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thu. (9AM-6PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Jason D Cardone
Examiner
Art Unit 2142

December 3, 2003